

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/942,052	Applicant(s) RAITANO ET AL.	
	Examiner David J. Blanchard	Art Unit 1643	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David J. Blanchard.

(3) James J. Mullen III.

(2) Larry R. Helms.

(4) Shane Poppe.

Date of Interview: 15 August 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: Protein expression data of the claimed sequence in cancer tissue.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tang et al (WO 01/53312).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


LARRY R. HELMS, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The substance of the interview included a discussion of the Tang et al reference and the earliest effective 102(e) date. The rejection relies on the date of USSN 09/488,725, i.e., 1/21/2000, and applicant argues that the '725 application does not disclose the polypeptide sequences. A sequence search will be performed against the '725 application. Also discussed the utility rejection and applicant provided protein expression data which will be submitted for consideration by the examiner.